arXiv:1207.2438v2 [physics.gen-ph] 24 Jul 2012

Bell's fifth position & supermartingale statistics.

J.F. Geurdes

C. vd. Lijnstraat 164 2593 NN Den Haag Netherlands.

Abstract. It is demonstrated that the CHSH supermartingale statistics of the computer triad, is inconsistent. The supression of responses implicit in the supermartingale further questions this 'no go'proof.

Keywords: CHSH contrast, martingales, computer simulation
PACS: 03.65.Bc

INTRODUCTION

In [1] and [2] Bell's fifth position is supported with supermartingale statistics. In the present paper we study supermartingale statistics for the classical computer triad $\mathscr{X}-\mathscr{S}-\mathscr{Y}$ with history exchange between $\mathscr{X}$, $\mathscr{S}$ and $\mathscr{Y}$. In a simulation of Bell's experiment [3] Alice, using $\mathscr{X}$ and Bob, using $\mathscr{Y}$ simultaneously receive from $\mathscr{S}$ information that is 'entangled'. Alice has two, unit vector, settings of the measurement instrument, $\mathbf{a}\in\{1_A,2_A\}$. Bob has $\mathbf{b}\in\{1_B,2_B\}$. $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{Y}$ produce values in $\{-1,1\}$.

COUNTING, PROBABILITY. EXPECTATION & RESPONSE

In [1] and [2] use is made of the elementary counting measure

$$\Delta_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})=\mathbb{1}\{(X_n,Y_n)=(x_n,y_n):x_n=y_n\}\mathbb{1}\{(A_n,B_n)=(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})\} \tag{1}$$

$\mathbb{1}\{(X_n,Y_n)=(x_n,y_n):x_n=y_n\}$ is unity when $x_n=y_n$ is true and it vanishes when $x_n\neq y_n$. Similarly, $\mathbb{1}\{(A_n,B_n)=(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})\}$ is unity when $(A_n,B_n)=(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$ and zero when $(A_n,B_n)\neq(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$. The uppercase letters indicate random variables. The lower case letters, $x_n,y_n\in\{-1,1\}$, $\mathbf{a}\in\{1_A,2_A\}$ and $\mathbf{b}\in\{1_B,2_B\}$ refer to the value of the random variables. The index n is the trial-number. If there are e.g. N trials, then the number of 'equal measurements' at setting pair $(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$ is $N^{=}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$ and, related to (1), is

$$N^{=}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})=\sum_{n=1}^{N}\Delta_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) \tag{2}$$

If $N(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})=\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathbb{1}\{(A_n,B_n)=(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})\}$ then there are $N^{\neq}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})=N(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})-N^{=}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$ unequal, i.e. $x_n\neq y_n$, measurements if no measurements are 'lost'. Hence, the elementary counting is related to the uncentered product moment

$$\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})=\frac{N^{=}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})-N^{\neq}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}{N(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}=\frac{2N^{=}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}{N(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})}-1 \tag{3}$$

Equation (3) represents the correlations between measurements [3]. In a CHSH contrast:

$$S = \hat{\rho}(1,1) - \hat{\rho}(1,2) - \hat{\rho}(2,1) - \hat{\rho}(2,2). \tag{4}$$

Without the A and B indices the position indicates which vector is set. Alice, the first, and Bob, the second. The set $\mathscr{A} = \{(1,1),(1,2),(2,1),(2,2)\}$ is defined and $(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) \in \mathscr{A}$. We use $S =_{def} \mathscr{C}_{(1,1)}\left(\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})|\mathscr{A}\right)$ with S as in (4). From (2), (3) and (4) we have $\Delta_n = \mathscr{C}_{(1,1)}\left(\Delta_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})|\mathscr{A}\right)$. In fact when $\forall_{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})\in\mathscr{A}} N(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) \approx N/4$ with N the total number of trials, $n = 1,2,3,...,N$,

$$\frac{(S-2)N}{8} \approx Z_N = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Delta_n \tag{5}$$

At step, n, a martingale is a conditioned probability process. The 'the history', $Z_1 = z_1,...,Z_n = z_n$, of a system co-determines the expected value of the future, Z_{n+1}. Mathematically, a supermartingale in $\{Z_i\}_{i=1,2,...}$ is

$$E\left(Z_{n+1}\,|\,Z_1 = z_1,...,Z_n = z_n\right) \leq z_n \tag{6}$$

Referring to (5) a violation of the $-2 \leq S \leq 2$ CHSH may occur if e.g. $z_n \geq E\left(Z_{n+1}\,|\,Z_1 = z_1,...,Z_n = z_n\right) > 0$ which is possible because $\Delta_n \in \{-1,0,1\}$. However, in [1] and [2] it is claimed that the probability of $\max\{Z_i : i \leq n\}$ 'substantially greater than zero', vanishes with increasing n. This urges to study martingales for computer triads. We ask whether supermartingale statistics is realistic.

Let us study an alternative counting measure

$$\Phi_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) = -\imath\{(X_n,Y_n) = (x_n,y_n) : x_n = y_n\}\left(1 - \imath\{(A_n,B_n) = (\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})\}\right) \tag{7}$$

From (1), $\Delta_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) = \Phi_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) + \Psi_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})$, with, $\Psi_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) = \imath\{(X_n,Y_n) = (x_n,y_n) : x_n = y_n\}$. In the latter expression there is no dependence on the settings. If we inspect, $\Phi_n = \mathscr{C}_{(1,1)}\left(\Phi_n(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b})|\mathscr{A}\right)$ gives $\Phi_n \in \{1,0,3\}$. The 0 arrises from a $x_n \neq y_n$. Moreover, if $\imath\{(X_n,Y_n) = (x_n,y_n) : x_n = y_n\}$ is Ξ_n it follows that

$$\Delta_n = \Phi_n - 2\Xi_n \tag{8}$$

The measure for Δ_n was already introduced in (5). For Φ_n we define,

$$V_n = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \Phi_m \tag{9}$$

Starting with (6) and using $Z_n = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + ... + \Delta_n$ the conditional expectation can be rewritten by transforming the probability distribution $f_{Z_1,Z_2,...,Z_n}(z_1,...,z_n)$ into the probability distribution $g_{\Delta_1,\Delta_2,...,\Delta_n}(\delta_1,...,\delta_n)$. Hence,

$$E\left[\sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \Delta_m\,|\,\Delta_1 = \delta_1,...,\Delta_n = \delta_n\right] \leq \sum_{m=0}^{n} \delta_m \tag{10}$$

The linearity of the expectation operator entails that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n+1} E\left[\Delta_m \,|\, \Delta_1 = \delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_n = \delta_n\right] \leq \sum_{m=0}^{n} \delta_m \tag{11}$$

The expectation of Δ_m given $\Delta_m = \delta_m$ in a sequence equals δ_m. Equation (11) gives

$$E\left[\Delta_{n+1} \,|\, \Delta_1 = \delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_n = \delta_n\right] \leq 0 \tag{12}$$

This is the supermartingale condition for $\{\Delta_i\}_{i=1,2,\ldots}$. Because, $\mathbb{1}\{(X_n, Y_n) = (x_n, y_n) : x_n = y_n\}$ and $\mathbb{1}\{(A_n, B_n) = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})\}$ are ingredients of Δ_n, Φ_n and Ξ_n, the conclusion from (12) carries over to (8) in an expectational form

$$E\left[\Phi_{n+1} \,|\, \Phi_1 = \varphi_1, \ldots, \Phi_n = \varphi_n\right] \leq 2E\left[\Xi_{n+1} \,|\, \Xi_1 = \xi_1, \ldots, \Xi_n = \xi_n\right] \tag{13}$$

Recall that $\varphi_i \in \{0, 1, 3\}$ and $\xi_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Let us write μ_{ξ_n} for the expectation of Ξ_n with history $\Xi_1 = \xi_1, \ldots, \Xi_{n-1} = \xi_{n-1}$. Because, $f_{\Xi_1,\ldots,\Xi_n}(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) \in [0, 1]$, it follows that, $E\left[\Xi_n \,|\, \Xi_1 = \xi_1, \ldots, \Xi_{n-1} = \xi_{n-1}\right] \leq 1$, hence, $0 \leq \mu_{\xi_n} \leq 1$. Note that if $f_{\Xi_1,\ldots,\Xi_n}(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{n-1}, 0) > 0$ we see $\mu_{\xi_n} < 1$.

The μ_{ξ_n} is not a random variable. Transform $f_{\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_n}(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n)$ into a distribution of $\Gamma_n = \Phi_n - 2\mu_{\xi_n}$. The expression (13) is maintained in the Γ system. This is true because, with the conditional probability, $f_{\Phi_{n+1}|\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_n}(\varphi_{n+1} \,|\, \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n)$ and the μ_{ξ_n} equation (13) can be written as

$$\sum_{\varphi_{n+1} \in \{0,1,3\}} \left(\varphi_{n+1} - 2\mu_{\xi_{n+1}}\right) f_{\Phi_{n+1}|\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_n}(\varphi_{n+1} \,|\, \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n) \leq 0 \tag{14}$$

Note

$$f_{\Phi_{n+1}|\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_n}(\varphi_{n+1} \,|\, \varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n) = \frac{f_{\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_{n+1}}(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1})}{\sum_{\varphi_{n+1} \in \{0,1,3\}} f_{\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_{n+1}}(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1})} \tag{15}$$

If we then go to $f_{\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_{n+1}}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1})$ we get

$$f_{\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_{n+1}}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n, \gamma_{n+1}) = f_{\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_{n+1}}(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}) \tag{16}$$

and note $\gamma_i \in G(\varepsilon_i)$ with $G(\varepsilon_i) = \{\varepsilon_i - 2, -1 + \varepsilon_i, 1 + \varepsilon_i\}$ and $\varepsilon_i = 2(1 - \mu_{\xi_i})$.Equation (14) transforms into

$$\sum_{\gamma_{n+1} \in G(\varepsilon_{n+1})} \gamma_{n+1} f_{\Gamma_{n+1}\,|\,\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_n}(\gamma_{n+1} \,|\, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \leq 0 \tag{17}$$

Or, in terms of conditional expectation

$$E\left[\Gamma_{n+1} \,|\, \Gamma_1 = \gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_n = \gamma_n\right] \leq 0 \tag{18}$$

This is the supermartingale condition for the Γ system. Note that $\Gamma_i \geq \Delta_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ where $\Xi_i = 1$. With the use of the Γ we build a measure: $X_n = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \ldots + \Gamma_n$. It follows from (18) that $\{X_i\}_{i=1,2,..}$ constitutes a supermartingale.

For our present purpose it is sufficient to derive a less strong than Hoeffding's probability estimate from Markov's inequality. The Markov inequality [4] follows from $0 < c\mathbb{1}\{Y \geq c\} \leq Y$ and is, $cP(Y \geq c) \leq E(Y)$.

Let us take $Y = e^{t \max_{i \leq n}\{X_i\}}$ and $c = e^{tk}$ for $t \geq 0$ real. If, $\hat{X}_n = X_{n^*} = \max_{i \leq n}\{X_i\}$ then

$$E\left(e^{t \max_{i \leq n}\{X_i\}}\right) = E\left(\exp\left[t \sum_{m=1}^{n^*} \Gamma_m\right]\right) = \left(E\left(e^{t\Gamma_m}\right)\right)^{n^*} \tag{19}$$

$E(\Gamma_m \Gamma_n) = 0$ for $n \neq m$ etc. $\Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_m, ...$ uncorrelated random variables. Note there is a difference between $E(\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2) = \sum_{\gamma_1 \in G(\varepsilon_1)} \sum_{\gamma_2 \in G(\varepsilon_2)} \gamma_1 \gamma_2 f_{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ and the conditional $E(\Gamma_1 | \Gamma_2 = \gamma_2) = \sum_{\gamma_1 \in G(\varepsilon_1)} \gamma_1 f_{\Gamma_1 | \Gamma_2}(\gamma_1 | \gamma_2)$. Suppose, $\forall_{m=1,2,...} E(\Gamma_m) \leq 0$ and $0 < t \leq t_{max}$ and t_{max} small positive. We then may $O(t^3)$ approximate:

$$E\left(e^{t\Gamma_m}\right) \approx 1 + tE(\Gamma_m) + \frac{1}{2} t^2 E(\Gamma_m^2) = u(t) \tag{20}$$

From (20) we must have $\forall_{0 < t \leq t_{max}}\, 0 < u(t) < 1$. This implies that

$$t_{max} \leq \frac{-2E(\Gamma_m)}{E(\Gamma_m^2)} \tag{21}$$

Hence, in the interval $0 < t \leq t_{max}$ the approximation $u(t)$ is in the interval $(0,1)$. This implies that $E(Y)$ with $Y = e^{t \max_{i \leq n}\{X_i\}}$ gives $E(Y) \leq 1$ and Markov's is

$$P\left(\max_{i \leq n}\{X_i\} \geq k\right) \leq e^{-tk} \tag{22}$$

Note also that $E(\Gamma_m) \leq 0$ is not without ground. Under predominantly $\Xi_i = 1$, i.e, $prd(\Xi_i = 1)$, the expectation $E(\Gamma_i) \approx (3 - 2\mu_{\xi_i})\frac{1}{4} + 3(1 - 2\mu_{\xi_i})\frac{1}{4} = \frac{3}{2} - 2\mu_{\xi_i}$. For $\mu_{\xi_i} = 1$, the Δ_i has $E(\Delta_i) \approx -\frac{1}{2}$ as the CHSH counting measure's expected value comes close to $\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} = -\frac{1}{2}$ when $prd(\Xi_i = 1)$. Conclusions drawn from (22) must be independent of sampling and not contradictory. Given, $X_{n^*} = \max_{i \leq n}\{X_i\}$, then

$$X_{n^*} = V_{n^*} - 2 \sum_{m=1}^{n^*} \mu_{\xi_m} \tag{23}$$

Combining with (22) the following equation arises

$$P\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n^*} \mu_{\xi_m} \leq \frac{V_{n^*} - k}{2}\right) \leq e^{-tk} \tag{24}$$

Let us suppose $n_3^* = \#\{i = 1, 2, ..., n^* : \Phi_i = 3\}$, with, $n_1^* = \#\{i = 1, 2, ..., n^* : \Phi_i = 1\}$ and with $n_0^* = \#\{i = 1, 2, ..., n^* : \Phi_i = 0\}$. Furthermore assume, $n_0^* < n_1^* < n_3^*$ and note $n_3^* + n_1^* + n_0^* = n^*$. From (9) it then follows that $V_{n^*} = 3n_3^* + n_1^*$. If $V_{n^*} = 3\pi_V n^*$ and $k = \pi_k n^*$, we get $3\pi_V = 3\left(\frac{n_3^*}{n^*}\right) + \left(\frac{n_1^*}{n^*}\right)$. Let us suppose

$$\exists_{q \geq 0} \exists_{\pi_k > 0}\, q = \frac{3\pi_v - \pi_k}{2} \approx 1 \tag{25}$$

then, $\pi_k \approx \frac{3n_3^*+n_1^*-2n^*}{n^*}$, such that, $3n_3^* + n_1^* > 2n^*$, gives $k = 3n_3^* + n_1^* - 2n^* > 0$, when $q \to 1$. This leads us to

$$P\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n^*} \mu_{\xi_m} \leq n^*\right) < 1 \tag{26}$$

in V_{n^*} distribution. But we may also write (26) as

$$P\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n^*} M_{\xi_m} \leq n^* \,|\, M_{\xi_1} = \mu_{\xi_1}, ..., M_{\xi_n^*} = \mu_{\xi_n^*}\right) < 1 \tag{27}$$

in a 'conditioned' M_{ξ_i} probability distribution. Note however that $\sum_{m=1}^{n^*} \mu_{\xi_m} \leq n^*$ with absolute certainty. This means $P\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n^*} M_{\xi_m} > n^* \,|\, M_{\xi_1} = \mu_{\xi_1}, ..., M_{\xi_n^*} = \mu_{\xi_n^*}\right) = 0$ and we do not get that from (27). Hence, a contradiction from the supermartingale in Z_n.

Subsequently, look at (18) and take $N = n+1$ to study the transition N to $N+1$. The history up to the N-th trial is given by $.., \delta_{N-1}$. We write

$$g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N) = \sum_{\delta_{N+1} \in \Omega_{\Delta_{N+1}}} g^{[N+1]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N, \delta_{N+1}) \tag{28}$$

such that $g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N)$ is the probability distribution for $\Delta_1, ..., \Delta_N$. Let us assume that the $\leq$ in (12) is replaced (at a sufficient numer of trials) by the $<$ sign. From a feasible strict supermartingale condition $0 < \max\{g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, 0), g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, 1)\} < g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, -1)$ and (28) it follows $g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N) > g^{[N+1]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N, -1)$. So

$$g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, -1) \geq g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N) > g^{[N+1]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N, -1) \tag{29}$$

Hence,$1 \geq g^{[N]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, -1) > g^{[N+1]}(.., \delta_{N-1}, \delta_N, -1) \geq 0$. We observe a decrease in probability for $\delta_i = -1$, $(i > N_0)$.

CONCLUSION

Supermartingale statistics of a computer triad is contradictory. In addition, with increasing number of trials, the supermartingale governed triad will tend less and less to $X_i = Y_i$ responses for $\mathscr{A} \setminus \{(1,1)\}$ settings. This strengthens the contradiction (27). If we postulate that in nature each event has its own random sequence 'fingerprint', a computer in the triad can, using the trial history, figure out the position in the random table of the other two and estimate their pattern of randomness. Randomness relates to events and the entities that further the events. It is no magic.

REFERENCES

1. R. Gill, arXiv:030159v1 (2003).
2. R. Gill, *Time, Finite Statistics and Bell's fifth position* , p 188, Foundations of Probability and Physics, Växjö Sweden, (2002).
3. J.S. Bell, *Physics*, **1**.195. (1964).
4. R.V. Hogg & A.T. Graig, *Introduction to mathematical statistics*, 3-rd Ed., MacMillan Int. NY (1970).